HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 33 Saturday, August 18, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

Nixon: As the GOP delegates begin to arrive in San Francisco, it looks as if the "dump-Nixon" drive is over. For practical purposes, it ended when Herter announced that "the continued use of my name is entirely unacceptable to me." Before that, several Republican politicians had talked rough to the President. They warned that Eastern internationalists were about to throw a big slush fund into a last minute drive for Herter, unless the President found a way to discourage it. Ike replied he would tolerate no such shenanigans and arranged for the well-publicized Nixon-Dewey breakfast, after which Dewey told the press he was "for Dick." GOP leaders also advised against the kind of "high-level" campaign — reminiscent of Dewey's in 1948 — toward which Ike has been leaning. They told him only Nixon — of those being mentioned for the Vice-Presidency — could put on the slugging campaign necessary to hold public interest in competition with the no-holds-barred attack coming from the Democrats.

"Pull A Wayne Morse?": Political observers are talking about the possibility that Harold Stassen might "pull a Wayne Morse" after the convention gives the No. 2 place to Nixon. An ardent Eisenhowerite in August, 1952, Morse became an equally ardent Stevensonite in October.

Top New Dealers — journalistic and political — have started buttering up the ex-boy wonder Stassen. They now say Childe Harold was "prematurely right" about Senator McCarthy; his attitude toward Nixon's 1954 campaign speeches proves him to be a "man of great courage" and a "genuine liberal."

GOP leaders expect no more loss from a Stassen defection than from Morse's in 1952. Ike carried Morse's own State of Oregon by a landslide (420,000 to 270,000).

Clement: Republicans were not the only listeners repelled by Governor Clement's attempt to equal William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" address, which stampeded the 1896 Democratic convention into nominating the then relatively unknown ex-Congressman from Nebraska. Murray Kempton of the New Dealing *New York Post* gave Clement the treatment the "liberals" usually reserve for Senator McCarthy.

"He is an arm-pumper and an elbow-crooker and a one-note man who bellows and never coos. Even so he has a massive reputation as an orator, and was accepted by the Stevenson people to perform last night on the theory that he would set Lake Michigan ablaze."

The left-wing columnist ranked Clement a few shades below Huey Long and Gerald L. K. Smith. "Presumably," he wrote, "when they finished their chores, you could find people who were moved to the depths of their souls — however ridiculous the reason; last night you could only find people who thought other people had been moved. . .

"Last night, the Democratic party yielded up its soul to the hucksters: It gave the boobs stuff which would disgust any civilized man on the obvious theory that this is the stuff one gives the boobs.

"And it wasn't even any good. It was a wild, transparently insincere farrago of lies, smears, and citations of God as a deserving Democrat. . . . Something has to be said for dignity. Fraudulent sincerity and humility are just a better pose than fraudulent arrogance and frenzy. There was not one bit of kindness, love, dignity or genuine professional skill in it.

"I think Gerald L. K. Smith even now, gone in the larynx though he is, could whip Frank Clement in a baying contest any day in the week. There were times when you could almost like Gerald; this man isn't even an honest rogue."

Clement's statement that Vice President Nixon is "the most politically intemperate individual in the history of modern American politics" sent

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Capitol Hill journalists scurrying to the "morgues" to hunt up quotes from "The Master." From the hundreds of "Trumanisms" came these glaring examples of 1948 campaign oratory:

"The Republicans are 'gluttons of privilege'" (an accusation repeated six times in succession) . . . and "the notorious do-nothing Republican 80th Congress . . . has stuck a pitchfork in the farmer's back . . . What they have taken away from you thus far will be only an appetizer for the economic tapeworm of big business." (Dexter, Iowa)

"Either the standard Republicans will buy the election or the standard Democrats will win." (Raleigh, N. C.)

"The Republican party today is controlled by silent and cunning men who have a dangerous lust for power and privilege. . ." (Chicago)

"The Communists would like to bring about my defeat and elect a Republican President." (Chicago)

Wayne Morse, who bids for re-election this fall in Oregon, is perhaps the most widely avoided man in the United States Senate. In the Senate, he speaks three times as many hours as his nearest oratorical rival. As soon as Morse rises, the Senate immediately empties for the next hour and a half.

He is known as a backflip artist without peer. Morse and his Oregon colleague, Richard Neuberger, now make up a two-man rotten borough for the ADA on every roll call. Yet in 1950, Neuberger accused Morse of reducing "to an exact science the technique of leading a political double life," adding that "no Parisian roué ever dashed more expertly between boudoir and counting house than does Morse between the dinners of the ADA and the annual banquets of the West Coast Lumberman's Association." In April, 1953, Neuberger observed that "Morse's political trail is dotted with the snowshoe tracks of broken alliances."

Morse began his career pretending to be an anti-New Dealer. In his first major political address in 1940, he scored the New Deal as "trying to convince us that the smaller our incomes become and the more taxes we pay, the higher our incomes will be." On March 9, 1944, he declared "that the New Deal is leading to the ultimate goal of state socialism."

Although Morse attacked President Roosevelt's seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. in 1944, by 1951 he was defending Truman's seizure of the steel mills, based on the "inherent powers" of the Presidency.

On the question of Communist China, Morse has an unparalleled record of advocating appeasement and surrender. He voted against ratification of the Mutual Defense Treaty with Nationalist China, Feb. 9, 1955. He voted against President Eisenhower's Formosa Resolution. He fought to allow a Finnish tanker, carrying 13,000 tons of jet fuel, to get through to the Red Chinese. He called President Eisenhower's resolution to defend Formosa "aggression," and his charges were quoted at length by the Chinese Communists.

Long a declared enemy of the filibuster, he grabbed headlines for himself in 1953 by breaking all previous filibuster records, talking for 22 hours and 26 minutes. His purpose: to stop the bill affirming state ownership of offshore oil.

His most famous backflip, of course, was his desertion of Eisenhower in 1952. Previously, he had boasted that he was the first GOP Senator to come out (in 1951) for Ike. In August, 1952, he wrote to the General: "I shall throw myself into your campaign with all my vigor, and do whatever I can to help you and Nixon."

When the acrobatic Morse threw himself, he missed, and landed in Stevenson's campaign instead. The principal Oregon papers, the *Oregonian* and the *Oregon Journal*, long-patient with their vertical whirling dervish, choked on this one. They began blasting away with unfriendly articles such as "Morse vs. Morse," "Senator Morse's Apostasy," and so on.

Humble Harry: In his *Memoirs*, Harry Truman alternates professions of humility with assertions that "I knew I was right and I knew the people were with me." Flashes of this old Truman "humility" were in evidence last week in Chicago. A reporter outside the Truman suite in the Blackstone overheard him tell a visitor: "I'm going down there and write this whole damned platform for them." Another pundit has it that a friend asked Truman if his support of Harriman might not lead to a deadlock nonentity such as the 1924 candidate, John

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

W. Davis. "Oh, no," said Harry (rearranging his sackcloth), "before I would let that happen, I would take the nomination myself." In his Wednesday morning press conference he said, "Stevenson could not win" — later modifying it to add — "at least without plenty of help." Asked, "what kind of help?" the former President said: "Help from an old man from Missouri."

Dawson-Controlled Chicago Negro Vote: Chicago politicos told HUMAN EVENTS staffmen that the Chicago Negro vote would be 90 per cent Democratic regardless of candidate or the civil rights plank. Negroes make up about 20 per cent of Chicago's population, and they go to the polls in force (as the white population does not). They are controlled by Negro Congressman Dawson who thereby is the real boss of the Chicago Democratic machine and the City Hall. Relief and housing regulations are interpreted as Dawson — with a vast bureaucracy under his direction — wants them interpreted. Economic considerations in Chicago mean more to the Chicago Negro than civil rights in Mississippi.

Pie In The Sky: "You name it, the Democrats promise it," was the general comment in the press box to the economic provisions of the Democratic platform.

The Democrats promised to balance the budget and cut taxes, while at the same time increasing Federal expenditures by amounts that could total ten or twenty billions if the promises are fully kept.

The Democrats promise to reduce lower-bracket income taxes by increasing personal exemptions from the present $600 to $800. Loss of revenue would be $4.5 billion per year.

The Democrats promise to equal or outbid the recent proposal of the White House commission to reduce taxes on small business. Under the White House proposal, the tax on the first $25,000 of corporate incomes would be cut to 20 per cent — reducing Federal revenue by $500 million. Although not spelled out in the Democratic platform, the platform says that corporate taxes should be levied on a graduated basis. Texas New Deal Congressman Wright Patman's House bill would tax corporations on a progressive basis, reaching a top of 82 per cent.

To the farmers, the Democrats promise a return to 90 per cent parity and other Brannan Plan types of aid designed to "restore the full 100 per cent parity" which the Democrats claim the farmers enjoyed prior to this Administration. Farm experts say that this plank could cost $3 or $4 billion a year. Just one item, the promised purchase of dairy products alone, would cost $700 million a year..

The Democrats promise a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour and broadened coverage. It is standard operating procedure for organized labor to urge increases in the minimum wage "to help the unorganized"; but after each minimum wage increase, every international union sends instructions to its locals to demand the maintenance of existing differentials. Therefore, the end result is to cause inflation.

Furthermore, any area with enough political pull will be able to get "demonstration prototype reactors" — a program for the nationalization of atomic power which may commit the U. S. Treasury to the expenditure of many billions.

Present health and welfare measures are to be vastly expanded by "the party with a heart."

Foreign aid and technical assistance should be increased, especially to the underdeveloped countries — and it should be given through the UN, not directly from the U.S.

The platform reminds voters that the Democrats originated the Hull reciprocal trade pacts and says they favor more of the same; however, thinking of the Southern textile industry, the Democrats denounce the GOP for "flagrant disregard for important segments of our industry resulting in serious economic injury to hundreds of thousands of Americans engaged in these pursuits."

Profile In Courage: Arthur Bliss Lane, postwar Ambassador to Poland, who passed away August 14, fought the Soviet enslavement of that country. After Communism's victory, he resigned from the Foreign Service to devote all his energies to the fight against the Red menace. His book, *I Saw Poland Betrayed*, tells the inside story of Roosevelt-Truman blindness toward the Soviet threat. Had the Nation's leadership had Lane's vision, Eastern Europe would not have merely traded one set of inhuman dictators for another.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

KOREA, EGYPT, and National Interest

by PROFESSOR A. T. BOUSCAREN,
Marquette University.

Several years ago the United States capitulated to British and French pressures in Korea, and refused to win a military victory over the Chinese Communists even though it was in our national interest to do so. Countless American lives would have been saved in December, 1950, had MacArthur and Stratemeyer been given permission to bomb the privileged sanctuaries of Manchuria; and Red China would have been rightly punished for her acts of wanton aggression and the horrible war crimes perpetrated on American and Korean prisoners of war.

In those days Britain and France, together with their many influential supporters in this country, were opposed to a "get tough" policy against those who violate international law. They urged "moderation," and, in the end, appeasement. Yet today the shoe is on the other foot. Now our European friends are demanding that we join them in the toughest possible policy against Nasser of Egypt, because their national interests are involved. Anthony Eden recalls appeasement of fascist dictators, and calls for any action, including military action, against the dictator of Egypt. We, on the other hand, who are not immediately and directly affected by Nasser's moves, are trying to hold back the "warmongers" at Number Ten Downing Street and the Quai d'Orsai.

Randolph Churchill has just arrived in the United States to criticize our reluctance to go to war in the Middle East, and he echoes the sentiments of Britain and France. This time, the same American supporters of London and Paris who opposed the use of force against the territory of Red China after the latter openly engaged in military aggression violative of the UN Charter, now want war against Egypt, which has done something definitely un-cricket, yet quite short of what the international Communist movement has been doing with great regularity before and after the Korean war. Their reasoning, which indeed seems to be a rule of behavior in international politics, is to punish minor infractions of international law, but to "coexist" and try to "understand" those who are guilty of major infractions of that law. They are very courageous when faced with Nasser, but fear and cowardice motivates them when professional bullies like Mao Tse-tung appear on the scene of action.

The lesson to be learned from the Korean and Egyptian experiences would seem to be that those nations whose national interest is jeopardized by aggression are justified in taking whatever action they consider necessary, but that they are not justified in assailing other nations, whose national interest is not directly and immediately involved, for lacking enthusiasm for such action. We should have proceeded in our national interest in Korea, together with our most substantial ally, the Republic of Korea. We should not have worried too much about what the British and French thought of the matter. The result would have been a most happy one for us and our anti-Communist Asian allies, and an unhappy one for the dictators in Peking and Moscow. Today, Britain and France are free to act as their national interests dictate, and we are free to do likewise. In this instance it is not in our national interest to use our military power in defense of British and French interests, in such a way as would permanently antagonize the Arab world. Neither is it in our interest to drag the Soviet Union into the picture, as we recently did in London, over French and British protests. A new international board of control which would include the USSR would hardly be an improvement over control of the Canal by Egypt alone.

Letter from ROMAN L. HRUSKA, U.S. Senator from Nebraska: "HUMAN EVENTS fulfills the true role of a free press by vigorously, clearly and ably stating its point of view and by following up. For this reason, I respect it and I read it regularly."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS
HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIII, No. 33 HUMAN EVENTS August 18, 1956

Article Section

THE BOSS IS BAFFLED

Why Industrialists Are Helpless Against the Liberals; What They Can Do About It

By DAVID SHEA TEEPLE

WATCHING American industrial leaders correlate the activities of their multi-million-dollar corporations, one assumes that these men are capable of finding solutions to almost any problem.

To direct the exploration, production, advertising, distribution, sales, research and development of any one of a hundred American companies is as precise and difficult an assignment as one can imagine.

There is no doubt about it — "the boss" is intelligent. If he weren't, he wouldn't be "the boss."

Yet, there is one problem which constantly baffles him. It irritates him, it frustrates him, it bewilders him. *He doesn't understand government!* Because he is intelligent, you would think that "the boss" would devote a portion of his time and ability to studying government to find out why he so frequently loses in the political arena. *He doesn't!* That is why he is so baffled when he runs into the Washington maze.

Labor, the "liberals," and the left-wingers have been very effective in government during the last several decades. Industry has been almost impotent. This is not an accident. There are very good reasons to explain both success and failure.

ALMOST ALL of the New Deal-Fair Deal socialistic programs which are now so frustrating to business might have been avoided if the problems had been recognized and intelligently dealt with before they became *public issues*. There are sore spots today which if unattended will be collecting a toll of cardiac patients from the plush suites of the business world in 1976.

If a competitor were stealing his market, "the boss" would carefully study the product and marketing practices of that competitor and devise a program to combat the competition. If the first program didn't work, he'd try another. He would not just sit and wait for bankruptcy. The same formula works for government.

Do the "liberals" have a better product than their helpless enemies? Positively not! All of the fundamental blessings of this society are essentially by-products of our free enterprise, industrial, capitalistic system. The "liberals" have stolen our product and have been very successful in convincing many people that it is their own.

Once we realize that our product has been stolen, we are on the right track toward political effectiveness. Industry has been too busy taking the "cash" while the "liberals" took the "credit."

An essential ingredient for political success which the "liberals" possess and which industry lacks is internal organization. For example, within the ranks of labor, there are extreme differences of opinion — sometimes violent; yet when any issue arises which concerns a goal of labor, those differences are subordinated and the entire labor movement presents a united front. Let one union get into trouble and all the rest are helping to bail it out.

The organization is even more sensitive than this. The entire "liberal" movement is like a jellyfish — if you touch one tentacle, the whole organism responds. Fire one left-wing professor and you may anticipate (or at least you should, because you are going to get it) attacks from Organized Labor, the Americans for Democratic Ac-

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, the Civil Liberties Union, about 10 "intellectual" societies, about 13 "liberal" Senators, about 40 "liberal" Congressmen, and about 10 nationally-syndicated columnists, all of whom will take up the cudgels. Generally, they win.

Incidentally, they fight rough. Name-calling and character-assassination are "McCarthyism" only if done by conservatives.

In sharp contrast, let one segment of industry be unfairly attacked. Let's call it Company A. The first question that is asked in the board meeting of Company B is, "Was our name mentioned?" If their name wasn't mentioned, then that is generally the last question. They sit on the sidelines actually enjoying the beating that their competitor takes, even though the eventual outcome will vitally affect everyone. The natural and wholesome competition which industry has with industry is automatically carried over into the political field by industrial leaders — much to the detriment of their political effectiveness.*

Consider the recent steel strike. The American people were bombarded daily by every segment of the "liberal" movement in support of labor's position. No one spoke for the steel industry except those who were actually affected by the strike. It would have been a fantastic phenomenon if the oil, the mineral, or any other industry had voluntarily come to the assistance of the steel industry during the negotiations.

When the ADA supports labor in a situation such as this, it is called "education," not "lobbying," since theoretically the ADA has no pecuniary interest in the outcome.

The "liberals" understand this — the industrialists don't. They charge on Washington like the Light Brigade only when they are to be helped or hurt by a particular piece of legislation. They stay only until the issue is resolved and then hasten back to the home office. They don't understand that by the time they get to Washington, they have allowed their opponents, over a period of months, to establish a climate of opinion among the people which has already decided the issue before the vote has been taken.

They expect politicians, whom they neither understand nor admire, to "stand on principles" — especially if those "principles" happen to be in accord with the point of view of a particular industry at a particular time. They expect a politician to vote for or against a measure according to their "principles" when such a vote will result in his defeat at the next election.

The attitude of industries toward government and toward each other would be rather comical if it were not so tragic. They will do almost anything in the way of effort to increase profits ten per cent, and yet will sit idly by while the government depreciates the currency twenty per cent, resulting in a ten per cent net loss.

THE RECORD IS CLEAR. Industry is not politically effective — the demagogues and the liberals are! One might well say that if our industrial leaders are so rich, why ain't they smart! Here are some things they could do if they wanted to:

1. Examine their entire advertising budget and withdraw financial subsidies to socialistic individuals, institutions or organizations. I submit that it is impossible to find *one* conservative who is financially supported in any way by any segment of the "liberal" movement. I'd like to have a picture of Paul Hoffman's automobile company or the CIO sponsoring Fulton Lewis, Jr. If conservative industry *has* to subsidize "liberals," why shouldn't the "liberals" occasionally *have* to subsidize a conservative? Of course, they don't, and we don't have to either, and shouldn't unless we continue to be politically stupid.

*On rare occasions, such as Roosevelt's seizure of Montgomery Ward in 1944, businessmen have rallied to the support of their competitors. On the day following the seizure, April 27, General Robert E. Wood, President of Sears, Roebuck & Co., issued a statement denouncing Roosevelt's action as "forcible possession . . . in direct violation of constitutional rights . . . if the wartime powers of the President can be invoked to confiscate the property and business of Montgomery Ward & Co., then the President can seize the business of any merchant, or any other business enterprise, anywhere, any time."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Somebody told industry some time ago that when you give money to educational institutions, it is automatically a crime if you dare to ask how it is spent. The incredible situation therefore exists where industry subsidizes socialistic-minded professors who spew forth books which attack the basic premises upon which industry is predicated. Education is a wonderful, worthwhile objective only if the person is being *properly* educated. *Industry deserves no accolade for assisting in the education of socialists.* This is not a suggestion that industry attempt to dictate to our schools — merely a common-sense recommendation that industry *evaluate* where its money is going and for what purpose.

Try to name one conservative professor subsidized by the "liberal" movement! *They know where their money is going!*

There are many "eggheads" of conservative inclination in the United States, but because they are conservative they have great difficulty in securing proper teaching assignments, and in finding publishers for their books and articles. And through it all they are unsupported by industry.

Of the thousands of books and magazines published yearly, try to find a half-dozen which make any attempt to present the advantages which accrue to our people as a result of the capitalistic free enterprise system! Not a day goes by, however, without the appearance of some book which seizes upon some inequity in our social order and uses it as a springboard to attack the entire system. *If industry would subsidize its own "eggheads" maybe we could restore some equilibrium in academic circles.*

2. Because of its very nature, industry is composed largely of engineers, chemists, and technicians who are concerned about the production of a product. Many of them are very uninformed politically. One constructive suggestion is that all junior executives be required to study government both at the grass roots and in the nation's capital.

3. Industry must do away with the "footnote" concept of Public Relations. The socialists make a charge; it is dramatic; it is featured in the "liberal" press (*e.g.,* "If the natural gas bill is passed, it will cost 5 cents more to fry an egg.") Industry keeps 100 men up half the night for 3 days and prepares a voluminous report dealing in BTU's, the cost of gas at the wellhead, cost to the pipeline, cost of distribution, taxes, administration, and overhead, and eventually concludes that the charge is false. *The only trouble is that nobody ever reads it.* If they did they couldn't understand it. In the meantime the "liberals" have launched seven more charges which lead to more sleepless nights for the business moguls.

We must realize that industrial public relations in politics consists of establishing in the minds of the people a favorable climate of opinion *before* the issue arises — *not afterwards.* Industry can sell its products; why can't it sell its ideas? The answer is that nobody tries. We operate on the theory that "no news is good news." We wait for "bad news" before we act. This will not work in politics. By the time you hear the "bad news," the battle is lost.

Note the effectiveness of the left. Can you pick up any literature today without seeing a story on UNESCO, The UNITED NATIONS, CIVIL LIBERTIES, FOREIGN AID, or any one of the many programs which the "liberals" are pushing for every day?

4. Industry must undertake a thorough study of the "tax-exempt racket" under which the "liberals" can spend all they want to push their objectives and the conservatives can't spend a dime.

If an example is needed to prove the point, let us examine the recent gas bill. An oil man offered Senator Case $2,500 because he thought Case was sympathetic to the bill. Case *did not* accept the money and voted against the bill. *This was a crime* for which the oil man *is now under indictment.* The bill was vetoed. A national hullabaloo was raised. In the preceding six months, according to the official rec-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ords, three groups opposed to the passage of the same bill contributed over $5,000 to Senator Morse. He *took* the money. He voted the way they desired. *This was not a crime.* Here is the "liberal" double standard working at a gallop. They turn a horse chestnut into a chestnut horse and we stand around and watch. If we allow this situation to continue we will not win.

5. To be politically effective, industry must adopt a realistic attitude toward personnel. There are two areas that need proper staffing.

First: every corporation should have available at least one individual who has had recent experience on the staff of some Congressional committee. The only way really to learn how these committees work is to run one. It is astounding but true that the same business executive who can coolly order a 100-million-dollar plant expansion will get palpitations of the heart if handed a subpoena to appear before a Congressional committee by some person he would not hire as an office boy. He is afraid because he doesn't understand. He should have expert advice at hand.

Second: industry must learn from the "liberal" movement that it can well afford to secure positions in government for people who have a conservative philosophy and see that they remain there. The bureaucracy of our government today is overloaded with so-called "career" employees who share the philosophy of our opponents. They become "experts" because the "liberals" make them experts. When I see Mr. Harold Price, Director of the Civilian Applications Division of the Atomic Energy Commission, testifying before Mr. James T. Ramey, Staff Director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, concerning the course of our atomic energy power program, I know what sort of a bill will come out. You don't need a crystal ball; all you need to know is that both of these men were proteges of David E. Lilienthal and for many years served in the legal division of the TVA.

How differently industry operates. It occasionally sends a man to Washington, lets him remain a year, then recalls him and generally penalizes him in promotions and the like, for having had the audacity for daring to go in the first place. *If we are to be effective, we must understand that in our government most of the work is done by the second-echelon workers.* We must see that our sort of people get in those jobs and not let our opponents control the working mechanism of government no matter which political party is in power.

THE FIRST and probably most difficult step which industry must take in its effort to become politically effective is to realize that, imperfect though it may be, the most important science in the world is the science of government. If government goes too far to the right or too far to the left, it can close our schools, our churches, our laboratories, and our factories. It can deprive us of our material possessions, our liberties, and even our lives. Some people disagree with this. They quote Socrates, who once said, "There is no science of government." Look what happened to him when government got out of hand. Whether business likes it or not, government is here to stay. The only question is, "What kind of government?" Industrial leaders of our nation can either take the "hemlock cup" or decide to play a major part in government's future development.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $20 per thousand.

David Shea Teeple has held many responsible positions in the Executive and Legislative branches of government. He is now consultant to industry and to several Congressional committees and Executive departments.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED